- 1			
1	Glenn D. Pomerantz (SBN 112503) glenn.pomerantz@mto.com MUNGER, TOLLES & OLSON LLP 350 South Grand Avenue, Fiftieth Floor Los Angeles, California 90071		
2			
3			
4	Telephone: (213) 683-9100		
5	Brian C. Rocca (SBN 221576)		
6	brian.rocca@morganlewis.com MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP		
7	One Market, Spear Street Tower San Francisco, CA 94105-1596		
8	Telephone: (415) 442-1000		
9	Counsel for Defendants Google LLC et al. [Additional Counsel Appear on Signature Page]		
11	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION		
12			
13			
14	IN RE GOOGLE PLAY STORE ANTITRUST LITIGATION	Case No. 3:21-md-02981-JD	
15	ANTITRUST LITIGATION	GOOGLE'S STATEMENT	
16	THIS DOCUMENT RELATES TO:	REGARDING RESPONSE OF EPIC GAMES, INC. TO THE STATES,	
17 18	State of Utah et al. v. Google LLC et al., Case No. 3:21-cv-05227-JD	CONSUMER COUNSEL AND GOOGLE'S JOINT STATEMENT Judge: Hon. James Donato	
19	In re Google Play Consumer Antitrust		
20	Litigation, Case No. 3:20-cv-05761-JD		
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			
26			
27			
28			

Defendant Google respectfully submits this statement regarding Epic's Response, ECF No. 1070 (Mar. 3, 2025),¹ to the Joint Statement submitted by Google, the States, and Consumers (the "Settling Parties"). ECF No. 1067 (Feb. 10, 2025).

This Court ordered the Settling Parties to file a joint statement addressing the consistency of the Proposed Settlement with the *Epic* Injunction. ECF No. 1056 (Nov. 22, 2024). The Court indicated that it would not approve a settlement that "contradicts or dilutes" the *Epic* Injunction. *Id.* The Settling Parties submitted a Joint Statement on February 10, 2025, to address the Proposed Settlement's consistency with the *Epic* Injunction. ECF No. 1067. The Joint Statement "compares the injunctive terms of the Proposed Settlement with the *Epic* Injunction and explains how the two would operate without contradiction or dilution." *Id.* at 1.

Epic's Response presents its view on the interpretation of Paragraph 5 of the *Epic* Injunction, but takes no position on the consistency of the Proposed Settlement and the *Epic* Injunction. The following three points remain clear, which Epic's Response does not address or dispute:

First, while the Settling Parties and Epic read Paragraph 5 of the *Epic* Injunction differently as to whether it includes a sim-ship prohibition, under either reading, nothing in the Proposed Settlement contradicts or dilutes Paragraph 5 of the *Epic* Injunction.

Second, if both the Proposed Settlement and the *Epic* Injunction go into effect, Google will have to comply with the terms of *both* decrees, and nothing in the Proposed Settlement would excuse Google from complying with Paragraph 5 of the *Epic* injunction.

Third, the Court's approval of the Proposed Settlement does not require the Court to interpret Paragraph 5 of the *Epic* Injunction at this time. To the extent Epic wants the Court to address whether Paragraph 5 covers sim ship agreements, it can ask the Court to do so at the appropriate time in the *Epic* case.

Accordingly, the Court should "approve the issuance of notice to affected consumers, the first step in the process leading to final settlement approval," ECF No. 1067 at 1, as requested by

Case No. 3:21-md-02981-JD

¹ All references are to the MDL Docket, *In re Google Play Store Antitrust Litigation*, No. 3:21-md-02981-JD.

Case 3:21-cv-05227-JD Document 587 Filed 03/14/25

Page 3 of 4

E-FILING ATTESTATION

I, Glenn D. Pomerantz, am the ECF User whose ID and password are being used to file this document. In compliance with Civil Local Rule 5-1(i)(3), I hereby attest that the signatory identified above has concurred in this filing.

Glenn D. Pomerantz

Case No. 3:21-md-02981-JD